

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully reviewed the office action mailed on March 25, 2005. In response, the applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 to highlight a thermally conductive path between a housing and at least one electronic component inside of the housing through a thermal plate according to an embodiment of the present invention.

In the office action, the examiner rejected claims 1, 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,742,478 to Wu (hereinafter “Wu”). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. While Wu is generally to heat removal, Wu describes a power converter. Wu does not teach or suggest a that has air flow perforations over more than half of at least one surface according to independent claim 1. Moreover, Wu does not teach or suggest a thermal plate that is in thermally conductive contact with a housing and a component as required by independent claims 1 and 9. Rather, Wu teaches a printed circuit board that is suspended within a housing that is cooled by air blown by a fan over a heat conductor 41. (See Figures 2, 2A and 3; Column 3, lines 14-29). Accordingly, Wu does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 9 and therefore does not anticipate these claim or claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

In the office action, the examiner rejected claims 2-4 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Wu and U.S. Patent No. 4,504,156 to Currie et al. (hereinafter “Currie”) and 6-8 and 10-16 over this combination further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,540 to Kruger et al. (“Kruger”). The Examiner argues that Wu teaches all of the elements of the claim 1, for example, except for a thermally conductive and compliant pad among other things. However, as discussed above, it is noted that Wu lacks a teaching of a thermally conductive path between a housing and an electronic component of any kind. Currie similarly lacks a teaching of a conductive path

between a housing and a component. Rather, Currie dissipates heat through a thermal plate that is liquid cooled, not a housing. Accordingly, no combination of Currie and Wu includes all of the elements of independent claims 1 or 9 or claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, the Examiner has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP

Dated: June 27, 2005
By: 
Robert C. Bertin, Registration No. 41,488
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile